

DESTROYING THE DIES.

A Task Performed at the Government Mint at the End of Each Year.

A little roll of metal red with fire was placed upon the anvil, a sledge hammer fell twice upon it, three tiny sparks shot into the air, and the molds of the old year's double eagle gold coins were wiped out forever. It was a thousandth part of the work that lasted all day at the mint, the destroying of the 1887 dies.

This is a novel form of destruction that falls to the lot of the money-making establishment's blacksmiths at the end of each calendar year, and is the only sure way of preventing the wily counterfeit from making spurious coin without regard to date. The dies of the mint are the stamps that imprint on the coin all that fancy business that, when rubbed off by time, gives the street car conductor a chance to insult the holder by refusing to accept it. For instance, it stamps on the dollar the face of the beautiful lady encircled by stars and makes a strong contrast on the other side by printing a game looking eagle perched on arrows under "In God we trust."

The die is a little round chunk of steel about three inches long, sloping off at the top, which makes it look like a miniature milkman's can without handles. On the top of it is cut the face of the coin it manufactures, with the date of the year, and something to think about when you look at them is that the die of a penny costs the Government no less than the die that makes precious the twenty-dollar gold piece. Coiner Steel, of the mint, signed the death warrant of the old year's dies. It meant the destruction of a thousand of 1887's money-makers. Every stamp, from double eagles to dollars in gold, from dollars to ten-cent pieces in silver, the dies in nickel and the pennies in copper were doomed.

The place of execution was the gloomy shop in the basement weirdly lit by hungry firelight. At 9:30 o'clock the dies were taken from their cells upstairs and conveyed thither in black coffin-like pans. Coined gold flung merrily on all sides as the procession passed. What regret had gold for the steel that gave it power to ruin souls? So the dies of '87 passed to their fate unwept.

The little coiners of big money were first sacrificed. The dies of gold were flung by handfuls into the flames. There they lay until the steel grew red and the face of Columbia blushed crimson. They were not taken out by hand, but with iron tongs, and placed right-end upward on the anvils. Then the smithy raised his sledge hammer aloft and struck each one full in the face. A shower of sparks, a smashed sound and the agony was over. The ring of the steel had gone, the face vanished like magic and the die of the past was but crushed, unshapely metal.

—Philadelphia Press.

ASSISTING THE POOR.

Mrs. Bowser Tells How She Complied With Mr. Bowser's Instructions.

"Do you know," said Mr. Bowser as he suddenly looked up at me the other evening, "that you are getting the reputation of being the hardest-hearted woman on this street?"

"Why, not? Who calls me hard-hearted?"

"Every body. They say you fire every applicant for charity off the steps before they can draw a long breath."

"But there are a good many impostors around this winter."

"How do you know an impostor from an unfortunate?"

"Why, by—by—by—"

"You couldn't tell a pirate from a tax assessor, and you know it! Now, then, I want a change in this business. I want the poor and unfortunate to know they have a friend in me."

"But they come along and want food and drink and clothes and money, and I—"

"Don't you throw 'em away, Mrs. Bowser—not a single one! I was a poor boy myself once, and I know how it feels to be hungry and ragged."

"Then you must take the consequences."

"What consequence? Mrs. Bowser, I've got to have a serious talk with you some day soon! You are fostering sentiments which appal me, and which sooner or later bring you to the gallows. When a woman loses her feelings of pity and charity she has reached a dangerous stage. I may come home some night and find you have murdered our child."

"Let your patients come around, Mr. Bowser, and I will prescribe for them."

"Nothing further was said, and he hadn't been gone ten minutes next morning, when a couple of very healthy-looking young men rang the door-bell. I rather think Mr. Bowser met 'em on the corner and sent 'em to the house."

"Madam," began one of the pair, as I opened the door, "if you would be so very—"

"Oh, certainly—walk right in; you are two unfortunate young men. You have been sick and had bad luck, and are now trying to get a fresh start. Come right into the dining-room."

They were so astonished that I had to repeat the invitation.

I seated them at the table, told the cook to provide for them, and as I passed up stairs I heard one of them say:

"Well, Billy, this is rich! Shouldn't wonder if we could also strike her for a quarter apiece!"

I knew that they would ask for old clothes, because they were very shabby. I therefore brought them down two of Mr. Bowser's old suits. I also

ADVOCATES OF DISUNION.

Some of the Lessons Taught by Mr. Lamar's Contradiction.

The efforts of malignity and the basest partisanship have been foiled and Mr. Lamar takes his seat on the Supreme Court bench, "with the consent of the Senate." It was only a few days ago that the New York Tribune got its four legs in the trough and intimidated, through alleged letters from the Chisholmes, that Mr. Lamar had been a Klu-Klux murderer, or that his teachings led to indiscriminate slaughter, and that he ran the Department of the Interior entirely in the interest of ex-Confederates. Of course, that model newspaper would not hesitate at a lie or two more to bolster up its cowardly warfare against a Southern Statesman. The response of the Republican Senate to its outrageous assaults upon the character of Mr. Lamar was his confirmation by a majority of four. There are times when malice overreaches itself, even in the house of its friends, and this was a signal example.

Senator Stewart's courageous letter broke the force of the Tribune's influence and malice, and convinced it that there are limits even to the credulity of Republican Senators. Although the question of Mr. Lamar's confirmation is now settled, there are sentiments expressed in Senator Stewart's letter which will be of considerable interest to the Senate, whenever, on future occasions, some of their number will again venture to wave the "Bloody Shirt."

The necessity for a union of heart and sentiment between all the people of the great and growing States of the Mississippi valley must make them one people. The vast internal trade and constant intercourse and comingling together of the people of all sections is fast obliterating all prejudices, removing suspicion and distrust and substituting in their place friendship, confidence and mutual respect. It is too late for those who are dissatisfied with their former position to go back to the old position and the adoption of the three amendments recording the verdict of the war, to participate in these great events. Their records are made; this occasion furnishes no opportunity to gain a reputation for patriotism, to go to country, or for prudence and wisdom in devising and adopting measures of reconstruction. More than twenty years have elapsed since an opportunity for that purpose was open to all. Those who participated in the war, and who participated in those great events are solemnly pledged to receive in good faith the people of the South, restored to all the rights and privileges of citizens of the United States. They cannot afford to furnish the reason, to excuse or the reputation they earned in the great crisis by violating their pledges in refusing to any citizen of the United States, to whom full amnesty has been granted, the rights and privileges guaranteed by the constitution.

I will not now, by any act of mine, furnish cause for suspicion that the reconstruction measures, including the three amendments to the constitution, were not adopted in good faith, as a final solution of all questions involved in the war and as an irrevocable pledge between the North and South of union, fellowship, fraternity and all the rights of citizens of the United States. I do not propose to go behind that settlement and judge any man by the criterion which necessarily prevailed prior to the final adjustment, but shall, on all occasions, confine my investigations to his fitness in office, to his faithful observation of the solemn pledges reciprocally made by both sections of the Union in renewing their normal political relations. It is unreasonable to expect that the people of eleven States of the Union shall, during all the present generation, be excluded from participation in the judicial determinations of the highest court in the United States.

It should be borne in mind that those sentiments are expressed by a Republican, who entered the United States Senate in 1864, and was elected in 1869, and who took an active part in the reconstruction measures immediately after the war. His many declarations disposes of the plea that the interests of the Republican party demand the revival of the issues of the war. But it must also be remembered that the great body of the Republican Senators, under the leadership of Chandler, who was once rejected by the Senate for an office under the Government, took their stand under the folds of the "Bloody Shirt" and voted in favor of disunion, or its equivalent, the proscription of the Southern States "from participation in the judicial determinations of the highest court of the United States."

The confirmation of Mr. Lamar does not alter the fact that the Republican party is still wedded to the perpetuation of sectional hate, only that in the highest legislative body in the land there were three or four Republicans possessed of sufficient respect and courage to resist the proscription policy of their party.

Senator Sherman, the representative Republican of Ohio, has never lost an opportunity to testify his ardent desire to revive the spirit of sectionalism and to grope, ghoul-like, among dead issues. Senator Evarts, representing an intelligent, progressive Democratic State, through the favor of an unjust apportionment, shows himself as destitute of patriotic principle and justice as when he consented, like Sherman, to share with Hayes the proceeds of a National steal. Twenty-six other Republican Senators, including the notorious "Bill" Chandler, voted in favor of disunion. The organs of the party never ceased their disunion strain since Mr. Lamar's name was sent in. Such is the record made by the party at the beginning of the Presidential year—proscription of the South and the revival of the issues of the war. The people of the United States will not forget this record when they come to the polls next November. They do not desire the issues of the war revived after twenty-three years, but they recognize the existence of union and fraternal feeling between all the States. The party that countenances disunion will be buried beyond the hope of resurrection when next the people have an opportunity to give their verdict. —Albany (N. Y.) Argus.

—Don't forget one thing—a low tariff and high wages generally go together. That is one of the solemn facts of history in this country. —N. Y. Herald.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

ADVOCATES OF DISUNION.

Some of the Lessons Taught by Mr. Lamar's Contradiction.

The efforts of malignity and the basest partisanship have been foiled and Mr. Lamar takes his seat on the Supreme Court bench, "with the consent of the Senate." It was only a few days ago that the New York Tribune got its four legs in the trough and intimidated, through alleged letters from the Chisholmes, that Mr. Lamar had been a Klu-Klux murderer, or that his teachings led to indiscriminate slaughter, and that he ran the Department of the Interior entirely in the interest of ex-Confederates. Of course, that model newspaper would not hesitate at a lie or two more to bolster up its cowardly warfare against a Southern Statesman. The response of the Republican Senate to its outrageous assaults upon the character of Mr. Lamar was his confirmation by a majority of four. There are times when malice overreaches itself, even in the house of its friends, and this was a signal example.

Senator Stewart's courageous letter broke the force of the Tribune's influence and malice, and convinced it that there are limits even to the credulity of Republican Senators. Although the question of Mr. Lamar's confirmation is now settled, there are sentiments expressed in Senator Stewart's letter which will be of considerable interest to the Senate, whenever, on future occasions, some of their number will again venture to wave the "Bloody Shirt."

The necessity for a union of heart and sentiment between all the people of the great and growing States of the Mississippi valley must make them one people. The vast internal trade and constant intercourse and comingling together of the people of all sections is fast obliterating all prejudices, removing suspicion and distrust and substituting in their place friendship, confidence and mutual respect. It is too late for those who are dissatisfied with their former position to go back to the old position and the adoption of the three amendments recording the verdict of the war, to participate in these great events. Their records are made; this occasion furnishes no opportunity to gain a reputation for patriotism, to go to country, or for prudence and wisdom in devising and adopting measures of reconstruction. More than twenty years have elapsed since an opportunity for that purpose was open to all. Those who participated in the war, and who participated in those great events are solemnly pledged to receive in good faith the people of the South, restored to all the rights and privileges of citizens of the United States. They cannot afford to furnish the reason, to excuse or the reputation they earned in the great crisis by violating their pledges in refusing to any citizen of the United States, to whom full amnesty has been granted, the rights and privileges guaranteed by the constitution.

I will not now, by any act of mine, furnish cause for suspicion that the reconstruction measures, including the three amendments to the constitution, were not adopted in good faith, as a final solution of all questions involved in the war and as an irrevocable pledge between the North and South of union, fellowship, fraternity and all the rights of citizens of the United States. I do not propose to go behind that settlement and judge any man by the criterion which necessarily prevailed prior to the final adjustment, but shall, on all occasions, confine my investigations to his fitness in office, to his faithful observation of the solemn pledges reciprocally made by both sections of the Union in renewing their normal political relations. It is unreasonable to expect that the people of eleven States of the Union shall, during all the present generation, be excluded from participation in the judicial determinations of the highest court in the United States.

It should be borne in mind that those sentiments are expressed by a Republican, who entered the United States Senate in 1864, and was elected in 1869, and who took an active part in the reconstruction measures immediately after the war. His many declarations disposes of the plea that the interests of the Republican party demand the revival of the issues of the war. But it must also be remembered that the great body of the Republican Senators, under the leadership of Chandler, who was once rejected by the Senate for an office under the Government, took their stand under the folds of the "Bloody Shirt" and voted in favor of disunion, or its equivalent, the proscription of the Southern States "from participation in the judicial determinations of the highest court of the United States."

The confirmation of Mr. Lamar does not alter the fact that the Republican party is still wedded to the perpetuation of sectional hate, only that in the highest legislative body in the land there were three or four Republicans possessed of sufficient respect and courage to resist the proscription policy of their party.

Senator Sherman, the representative Republican of Ohio, has never lost an opportunity to testify his ardent desire to revive the spirit of sectionalism and to grope, ghoul-like, among dead issues. Senator Evarts, representing an intelligent, progressive Democratic State, through the favor of an unjust apportionment, shows himself as destitute of patriotic principle and justice as when he consented, like Sherman, to share with Hayes the proceeds of a National steal. Twenty-six other Republican Senators, including the notorious "Bill" Chandler, voted in favor of disunion. The organs of the party never ceased their disunion strain since Mr. Lamar's name was sent in. Such is the record made by the party at the beginning of the Presidential year—proscription of the South and the revival of the issues of the war. The people of the United States will not forget this record when they come to the polls next November. They do not desire the issues of the war revived after twenty-three years, but they recognize the existence of union and fraternal feeling between all the States. The party that countenances disunion will be buried beyond the hope of resurrection when next the people have an opportunity to give their verdict. —Albany (N. Y.) Argus.

—Don't forget one thing—a low tariff and high wages generally go together. That is one of the solemn facts of history in this country. —N. Y. Herald.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.

—A yearling that weighs seven hundred pounds is worth more than two weighing four hundred each.